

REMARKS

A. Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to because it included the capitalized word "Receiving" and the misspelled word "indicgfation." Accordingly, the word "Receiving" has been replaced with the word "receiving," and the word "indicgfation" has been replaced with the word "indication."

B. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Roethig* (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,705). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 1

Claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Roethig* does not teach, suggest, or disclose "wherein the second model is an abstraction of the first model."

Claims 2-4 and 7-10

Claims 2-4 and 7-10 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 11

Claim 11 is allowable for at least the reason that *Roethig* does not teach, suggest, or disclose "wherein the second model is an abstraction of the first model."

Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 11.

Claim 16

Claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that *Roethig* does not teach, suggest, or disclose “wherein the second model is an abstraction of the first model.”

Claims 19 and 20

Claims 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 16.

C. New Claims

Claims 21-26 have been newly added.

Claim 21

Claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Roethig* does not teach, suggest, or disclose “wherein the second model is an abstraction of the first model.”

Claims 22 and 23

Claims 22 and 23 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 21.

Claim 24

Claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Roethig* does not teach, suggest, or disclose “wherein the second model is an abstraction of the first model.”

Claims 25 and 26

Claims 25 and 26 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 24.

D. Cancelled Claims

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 17, and 18 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejections of these claims have been rendered moot.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-16, 19-26 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Sami O. Malas, Registration No. 44,893

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500